



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/023,538	12/17/2001	Markus Valter Witte	201-0028	5517

22844 7590 05/28/2004

FORD GLOBAL TECHNOLOGIES, LLC.
SUITE 600 - PARKLANE TOWERS EAST
ONE PARKLANE BLVD.
DEARBORN, MI 48126

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, DAVID Q

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2681

DATE MAILED: 05/28/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/023,538

Applicant(s)

FORD GLOBAL TECHNOLOGIES,
INC

Examiner

David Q Nguyen

Art Unit

2681

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 December 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

1. Claims 1,5,7-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Robert (US 6169497).

Regarding claim 1, Robert discloses a remote communication system for use with a vehicle, comprising: a first communication unit (fig. 1, 18), located within a vehicle fig. 1, 16), said first communication unit comprising a first transceiver (fig. 1, 28; and fig. 3, 50), connectable with a long-distance wireless communication network (fig. 1, system 10), such as a cellular network (fig. 1, satellite 23); and a second portable communication unit (fig. 1, 20 or 12 or 14; col. 4, lines 29-38), comprising a second transceiver (fig. 1, 20 or 12 or 14; col. 4, line 29 to col. 6, line 12), connectable with a unit for long-distance wireless communication, such as a cellular terminal (fig. 1, 20 or 12 or 14; col. 4, line 29 to col. 6, line 12), whereby said first and second communication units are connectable with each other using said long-distance wireless communication network (fig. 1, 20 or 12 or 14; col. 4, line 29 to col. 6, line 12); thereby

Art Unit: 2681

establishing a remote two-way communication link between said communication units (fig. 1, 20 or 12 or 14; col. 4, line 29 to col. 6, line 12 and col. 11, line 47 to col. 12, line 18).

Regarding claim 5, the remote communication system of Robert also discloses wherein said second communication unit further comprises a biometric sensor, for identifying a user (see col. 5, lines 30-43 and col. 8, lines 38-67).

Regarding claim 7, the remote communication system of Robert also discloses wherein said first communication unit further comprises a first memory circuit being connected with said first transceiver, and said second communication unit further comprises a second memory circuit being connected with said second transceiver, whereby an information item, stored in any one of said memory circuits is transmittable to the other one of said memory circuits, over said direct communication link when established (see fig. 1; fig. 3 and col. 4, line 29 to col. 6, line 12 and col. 11, line 47 to col. 12, line 18; col. 8, lines 38-67).

Regarding claim 8, the remote communication system of Robert also discloses wherein said first and second communication units each comprises an identification device, whereby a request for connection from any communication unit is tested to be qualified before enabling a connection between said communication units (see col. 5, lines 30-43 and col. 8, lines 38-67).

Regarding claims 9-10, the remote communication system of Robert also discloses wherein said first communication unit is connected with a vehicle computer within said vehicle (see col. 7, lines 25-32); wherein said first communication unit is connected with at least one vehicle data network, such as a controller area network within said vehicle (see col. 7, lines 25-61).

Art Unit: 2681

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 2-3 and 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Robert (US 6169497) in view of Sollestre et al (US 5864297).

Regarding claims 2-3 and 11, the remote communication system of Robert is silent to mention wherein said second communication unit is connectable with said unit for long-distance communication using a short-distance wireless communication link; wherein said second communication unit is a fob unit. However, Sollestre et al disclose second communication unit is connectable with said unit for long-distance communication using a short-distance wireless communication link; wherein said second communication unit is a fob unit (see col. 2, line 32 to col. 3, line 26). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the above teaching of Sollestre et al to Robert so that user can perform a remote check-up of the car, for example checking the gas level of the tank or whether the doors of the vehicle are locked or a travel plan may be transmitted to the vehicle.

3. Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Robert (US 6169497) in view of Logan (US 6631271).

Art Unit: 2681

Regarding claim 4, the remote communication system of Robert is silent to mention wherein said second communication unit is integrated with a cellular telephone terminal. However, Logan discloses said second communication unit is integrated with a cellular telephone terminal (see fig. 1 and col. 2, lines 44-54). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the above teaching of Logan to Robert so that user not only uses cell phone to communicate each other but user also use the cell phone to control user's car.

4. Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Robert (US 6169497).

Regarding claim 6, the remote communication system of Robert is silent to mention wherein a direct two-way wireless communication link is established between said first and second transceivers when said communication units are within a communication range from each other. Official notice taken that a direct two-way wireless communication link established between said first and second transceivers when said communication units are within a communication range from each other is well known in the art because RF signal is transmitted within limited distance in telecommunication.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to David Q Nguyen whose telephone number is 703-605-4254. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30AM-5:30PM.

Art Unit: 2681

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Erika A Gary can be reached on 703-308-0123. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3900.

DN

David Nguyen


ERIKA GARY
PATENT EXAMINER